MR. S. CHATTANATHA KARAYALAR (*Pattanapuram* cum *Shencotta*): May I know whether Government propose to enquire into the matter and obtain authentic information on the point?

MR. C. O. MADHAVAN (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): Government have already taken action.

Temporary bridge at the Neriamangalam kadavu.

122. MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Commerce and Industry, North*): Will the Government be pleased to state:

(*a*) the name of the officer who gave the contract for the construction of a temporary bridge at the Neriamangalam *kadavu* in Minam 1106;

(*b*) the name of the person to whom the contract was given;

(*c*) the amount of the contract;

(*d*) whether it was given after inviting tenders; and

(*e*) if not, the reason for the same?

MR. C. O. MADHAVAN (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): (*a*) Mr. K. Raja Raja Varma, Assistant Engineer, Kothamangalam Sub-Division.

(*b*) Mr. P. I. Gopalan Nayar.

(*c*) Rs. 3,420/-.

(*d*) No; by special arrangement.

(*e*) The work was urgent and had to be carried out in a short time and hence the most reliable contractor had to be engaged.

Members Selected for the Finance Committee.

PRESIDENT: At the election which was held last evening, the following members were elected to serve on the Standing Finance Committee for 1107:

Messrs.—A. Thanu Pillai, S. Krishna Pillai and K. Narayanaperumal Nadar.

Election of Members to the Central Road Board.

Members have to be elected to the Central Road Board and after the House rises to-day, the non-official members will please meet under the chairmanship of the Deputy President and elect four members, one from each revenue Division, for the Central Road Board from among those representing the general constituencies.

Members co-opted for the Kshatriya Bill.

I have also to inform the House that two members of the Kshatriya community have been co-opted as members of the House for the consideration of the Kshatriya Bill which is now before it namely Mr. M. Rajaraja Varma Raja M. A., B. L., Retired Devaswom Commissioner, and Mr. M. Kerala Varma Tampan, Vakil, Parur.

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS.

REVENUE RECOVERY REGULATION AMENDMENT BILL.

PRESIDENT: The House will now resume the consideration of Mr. Thanu Pillai's amendment to the Revenue Recovery Regulation Amendment Bill.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum*). Sir, I shall begin to-day by a reference to the powers of the Tahsildars in regard to the attachment

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

and sale of immovable properties. It was stated last Saturday by the Deputy President that so far as the powers of the Tahsildar in respect of the attachment and sale of immovable properties are concerned, there cannot be much harm in delegating those powers to the employees of the Sreepadom Palace in view of the fact that the Peishkar exercises the more important functions in connection with it. I think it will therefore be profitable to place before the House as concisely as possible the duties and functions of the Tahsildar in connection with immovable properties.

Before attachment is effected a written demand is to be served on the defaulter specifying the amount due, the land on which the revenue is charged, the date when it fell due and so forth. The notice has to be served in the manner prescribed for the service of summons in the Civil Procedure Code. If there is any objection in regard to the claim for arrears, that will have to be investigated and decided on by the Tahsildar himself. Then attachment will have to be effected by affixing the notice on a conspicuous part of the land or building to be attached either by the Tahsildar or through the Proverthicar acting under his written authority or any officer appointed and authorised by the Dewan Peishkar. This notice also shall specify the land on which the dues are charged, the date of default, the party in arrears and so on. This notice of attachment has to be affixed in the Taluk Cutcherry and also the Proverthy Cutcherry. In the case of claims by persons other than the defaulter, Mr. Krishna Aiyangar stated to the House that the claim has to be disposed of by the Peishkar and that the Tahsildar can only make an enquiry and submit the papers to the Peishkar. Sir, after all, that order is passed on the evidence taken by the Tahsildar. What is the material part of an enquiry? Is it the order so much as the material on which that order is based? I can boldly say and I believe everybody in this House will agree with me that the material part of an enquiry is the evidence in connection with that enquiry. Now, Sir, that evidence is supplied by the Tahsildar. He has to decide what evidence he is to admit and what evidence he is not to admit. It is more or less a judicial function. Suppose the Tahsildar does not admit all the relevant evidence, what could the Dewan Peishkar do? It may be said that the matter may be referred back to him; but it cannot be denied that the material portion of the work is done by the Tahsildar himself. And suppose, now, Sir, that the immovable property of a man who has no lands under the Sreepadom Palace is sought to be attached and sold. He must appear before the Sreepadom employee with a claim petition, let in evidence, subject himself to the orders of that Sreepadom employee in respect of what evidence should be admitted and what evidence should not be admitted and then the papers will go before the Dewan Peishkar and orders will be passed. That is the nature of the work the Tahsildar has to do in connection with the enquiry in relation to this claim. And so, I put to the House whether after all the Tahsildar's function is nominal or whether it is really such as should by no means be delegated to a person over whom Government have no control.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. A. Thanu Pillai.]

Section 32 lays down the rules to be observed in the sale of immovable property. It runs as follows :—

"In the sale of immovable property under this Regulation, the following Rules shall be observed :—

(1) All such sales shall be conducted by the Tahsildar unless, in any case, the Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner or the Division Peishkar may deem it necessary that the sale should be conducted by the Division Peishkar.

(2) Previous to the sale, the Tahsildar shall issue a notice specifying the name of the defaulter, the position, tenure and extent of land and the buildings therein, the amount of revenue assessed on the land or upon its different sections ; the proportions of the Public Revenue due during the remainder of the current Malabar year, and the time, place and conditions of the sale.

This notice shall be posted, 30 days at least before the sale, in the nearest Police Station-House, the Proverthikars and Taluk Cutcherries and on some conspicuous part of the land or building as the case may be.

(3) The sale shall be by public auction to the highest bidder."

There are also other rules. Now, all this has to be done and all these rules are to be observed by the Officer to whom is delegated the powers to be exercised by the Tahsildars. No doubt the sale has to be reported to the Peishkar for confirmation. Of course, these are not the only functions ; there are other functions which the Tahsildar has to discharge. But these are the most important of them. It is clear to any one who goes through the rules that the powers of the Tahsildar are of a nature that will not justify their delegation to an Officer of a private concern like the Sreepadom. As for the powers of a Peishkar, Mr. Krishna Aiyangar himself admitted that it will be dangerous to invest a person with the powers of the Peishkar without adequate disciplinary control over that person, especially in the case of attachment and sale of immovable property. I need not labour the point further and convince the House that it is clearly dangerous to invest such a person with powers to be exercised by a Peishkar under the Regulation. In this connection I wish to refer to one or two Sections of the Revenue Recovery Regulation to show how extensive the powers of a Peishkar under the Regulations are. I refer to Sections 36 and 42 of the Regulation. Section 36 relates to putting the purchaser of immovable property in possession of the property.

Section 36 reads as follows :—

"Where, notwithstanding such publication, any lawful purchaser of land may be resisted and prevented from obtaining possession of his purchased land, the Division Peishkar on application and production of the certificate of sale provided for by Section 34, shall cause the proper process to be issued for the purpose of putting such purchaser in possession in the same manner as if the purchased lands had been decreed to the purchaser by a decision of a Civil Court.

For purposes of this Section the Division Peishkar may exercise all the powers of a Civil Court under the Code of Civil Procedure."

Now in putting the purchaser of the property that is sold in possession of that property, the officer invested with the powers of the Division Peishkar may exercise all the powers of a Civil Court under the Civil Procedure Code for that purpose. I shall just refer to one Section

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

of the Civil Procedure Code simply to show the extent of the power that is conferred. I refer to Rule 95 of Order XXI of the Civil Procedure Code. It reads as follows :—"Where the Court is satisfied that the resistance or obstruction" that refers to a case where the person in possession resists the purchaser in his attempt to take possession of the property.

"95. Where the Court is satisfied that the resistance or obstruction was occasioned without any just cause by the judgment-debter or by some other person at his instigation, it shall direct that the applicant be put into possession of the property, and where the applicant is still resisted or obstructed in obtaining possession, the Court may also, at the instance of the applicant, order the judgment debtor, or any person acting at his instigation to be detained in the civil prison for a term which may extend to thirty days."

So, there may be cases where these Sreepadom employees will find occasion or will exercise the power of ordering the detention in the Civil prison of the person obstructing. So even the power of imprisoning the person can be exercised by an officer of the Sreepadom or by an employee of the Sreepadom if these powers are to be vested in such an officer. Of course, I know the Law Member will rise up and say that it is only in appropriate cases, when somebody resists the purchaser in his attempt to take possession and not in every case that this provision of law will be resorted to. But, Sir, I ask who is to decide which case is proper? This officer himself decides. If the Sreepadom Manager comes to the conclusion that if the sale is not respected and the person in power is obstructing possession he can order the man to be imprisoned. After all, who is this man who is sought to be given this power? Government have absolutely no control over him. Is it what this Council seeks to do or will do, I ask? Government may come forward with this proposal. But I ask, is this side of the House prepared to accept it? We must think of all the consequences of the step that we are taking. It is not conceivable that such a case will rise. Now, for any reason, whether tenable or untenable sound or unsound, a property belonging to a private individual may be sold by the Sreepadom Manager. He may issue in exercise of the powers of Peishkar a warrant for sale. Suppose the man in possession resists. The purchaser puts a petition before the Sreepadom Manager. He passes an order, "you shall surrender possession." It is not obeyed. Then he directs the man to be detained in the civil prison. I believe nothing more is wanted to convince the House of the utter lack of responsibility that will be exhibited if this amendment is allowed to get a place in the Statute Book of the land. Then, Sir, I pass on to another Section of the Regulation.

Section 42 reads as follows :—

"Where only a part of a property, bearing a single number in the account subject to the payment of a lump assessment may be sold, the assessment upon such part shall be apportioned by the Division Peishkars previous to sale....."

It may be held, at any rate it was contented by the Law Member on a previous occasion in discussing some provision of the Revenue Recovery Regulation here,—that under the provisions of that Regulation, it is not merely the property subject to the tax but any property

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. A. Thanu Pillai.]

belonging to the defaulter that may be sold for arrears of revenue. If that view of the law is accepted, and it is not unlikely that that view of the law will prevail in Courts,—what will be the position? A tenant holds land under the Sreepadom. He makes the default in the payment of pattom. The Sreepadom employee proceeds to attach the defaulter's property; but for some reason or other he attaches not the Sreepadom lands but say, Pandaravaka land, belonging to the defaulter. The Sreepadom man finds that it is not necessary to sell away the whole land but only a part of it. He sells a portion. Now that portion is purchased by a third party. The Sirkar tax due on the property has to be apportioned. This Section 42 says that the apportionment of Sirkar property will be done by the Peishkar, in this case the Sreepadom employee who exercises the powers of the Peishkar. Now, he will apportion the sirkar tax on the property sold and the Sirkar will have to accept that apportionment under the law. Sir, is it a state of things to be allowed? So, the Sreepadom officer or employee over whom Government have no control is even given the power of apportionment of tax due to Government upon property. Is it after realising all these implications, Sir, that this amendment is placed before the House? I wish to get an answer from the Law Member to these questions.

PRESIDENT: Is that order also not subject to revision?

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum*): Eevery order is subject to revision.

PRESIDENT: That also is.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum*): There is that fact. My point is that whether subject to revision or not—let it be revised a hundred times—are these powers to be exercised by a Sreepadom employee? Detaining a man in the Civil prison—after he is detained, what is the use of revision? Is that an answer to my question? Sir, evidently all these considerations were present in the mind of Mr. Krishna Aiyangar. While supporting the contention of the mover of the Bill; he admitted in this House that the delegation of the powers of Dewan Peishkars to these employees is dangerous—to use his own term. I say that it is not merely dangerous, it is worse than that.

So, Sir, considering the nature of the powers exercised by the Tahsildars and Peishkars, I do not think I need dilate further upon this aspect of the question, and I can leave it to the House to decide whether they would be discharging their duty if they do not accept my amendment. Several other contentions were raised by the learned Law Member and I do not propose to answer them in detail. I shall just refer to one or two.

The Law Member seems to think that the Government may appoint any person as their own Proverthicars or Tahsildars, and this House has no control over that appointment; and what difference does it make if they invest a Sreepadom employee with this power. I do

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

not think it is necessary to answer that. After all, they are Government servants, they are amenable to the control of Government and to the control of this House. But no such consideration is possible in the case of the Sreepadom employees.

Then, the Law Member made distinction between control over persons and control over actions. He would be content with control over actions. I am not content with that. I have referred to that in my first speech.

As for the power of revision, I have already stated what it amounts to and how thoroughly inadequate it is.

Then he referred to the right of suit conferred by Section 51.

That right of suit is against the Sirkar. Is it contended that for the persons over whom Government have no control Government should take responsibility? That is a very unwise proposal.

Then the Law Member said, "why, after all, the ultimate power rests with this House". You may repeal the Statute." Sir, while on this point, I must submit to this House most respectfully that my view of legislation is totally different from that of the Law Member. I do not legislate in order to be compelled to repeal that Legislation. We should do the work of Legislation in the hope and with the knowledge that we wish to have the law in force, not for repeal.

It was urged here that we are only conferring upon *Government* the power and the Government can be relied on to use that power well. Sir, for my part I take a totally different view. No doubt, we have to rely upon Government and trust Government to some extent. There is a limit. In this connection I may be permitted to read a passage from a speech delivered by the Right Honourable Lord Hewart while he was Lord Chief Justice of England. In that passage he refers to the powers of making rules and powers of sub-legislation vested in Government. This is what he says :—

> "It is a common place to say that the Rule of Law involves at least two things. One is the absence of arbitrary power on the part of the Government. The other is equality before the law. In other words, every man, whoever he may be and whether he be an official or not, is subject to the ordinary law of the land, administered by the ordinary tribunals. That is our system—the system which we owe to the Common Law. The other and opposite system, which is familiar on the Continent of Europe, implies and requires what is called "droit administratif." Pleasantly enough, we have not even a name for it. But it is, as you know, that body or rules and regulations which has to do with the position and the liabilities of State officials, the rights and the liabilities of private individuals in their dealings with officials as representing the State; and, finally, the special procedure by which those rights and liabilities are enforced. Under that system, of course, the rights of the State are determined by an extraordinary code; the consequential case-law is made by Government official; the Law Courts, properly so called, have no jurisdiction in matters concerning the State; and, on the contrary, questions concerning the State are decided by administrative bodies which have an official character and are composed exclusively of official persons. That is the exact opposite the negation, the antithesis, of the system which we proudly call our own. But is it certain that this system of ours—the Rule of law, equality before the law, and the exclusion of arbitrary power—is quite free from risks of

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. A. Thanu Pillai.]

invasion and diminution? No doubt there is not, and there is not likely to be, any open return to certain notions which were current in the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries, from the time of the accession of the Tudors to the time of the expulsion of the Stuarts. But has there not been during recent years, and is there not now, a marked and increasing development of bureaucratic pretensions, the essence and the aim of which are to withdraw more and more matters and topics from the jurisdiction of the Courts and to set them apart for purely official determination?

"It is not possible on the present occasion to enter into detail. But in England, at any rate, nobody who has eyes to see can fail to discern this mischievous purpose, which exhibits itself in at least three ways. One is to provide in express terms by statute that the decision of certain questions belongs to this or that Government Department, and that the departmental decision is to be final and binding upon all parties, and that that decision is not to be questioned in a Court of Law by proceedings in *mandamus*, *certiorari*, case stated, or otherwise. Another way is to confer upon a Government Department power to make rules and regulations which, when they are made, are to have the force of a statute. And yet a third way is by statute to empower a Government Department to make orders for the removal of difficulties, as it is pleasantly called, and actually for that purpose even to modify the provisions of the statute itself It may be that before long the legality of acts done, or purported to be done, by virtue of powers of some of these kinds, will have to be considered by the Courts. Meantime it seems to be important to watch very carefully the influences which are at work. After all, the price of liberty is unceasing vigilance, and it would indeed be a strange and distasteful paradox if, while we look askance at "droit adminstratif" under that name, we were to permit the restless pretensions of bureaucracy to establish in our midst what would be in effect a more arbitrary "droit adminstratif", unfettered even by the tribunals, such as they are which form part of the Continental system. The name "self-government" would be a mockery, and an irritating mockery, if it should come to mean Government by a vast army of anonymous officials, hidden from view but placed above the law, and administering a topsy-turvy system whereby the servants of the public had made themselves its master" (*Essays and observations* by the Rt. Hon. Lord Hewart of Bury.)

Sir, in this case what is suggested is that after all we are investing the Government and we can trust the Government with that power. Now thoughtful men take a very contrary view. This House should not lightly delegate this power to Government in the hope that that power will be properly used. My question is "why do they want this power." Evidently it is meant to be used. Sir, my objection as already stated is two-fold. In the first place, this power should not be used at all. No person over whom Government have no control should be invested with these powers. Secondly, we cannot trust Government with too much power. Either way, the proposal is highly objectionable. Let us minimise the injury at least by accepting this amendment.

Sir, I wish also to place before this House one other aspect of the matter which was referred to in the course of the discussion on Saturday. It was pointed out by Mr. Govindan that when the existing Regulation was passed, Sreepadom *pattom* was brought under the definition of the term public revenue, because, it was admitted at that time that the Sreepadom lands are crown lands. Now it seems doubtful whether the same position is admitted. I tried to elicit an answer from the Law Member on a former occasion but no definite

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

answer was forthcoming. I wish to know what he has to say in regard to that. If it is not admitted that the Sreepadom lands are crown lands but are only given possession of to the Sreepadom for purposes of enjoyment, even the basis of the existing statute, namely, Regulation I of 1068, goes and absolutely no argument can be built upon the fact that the Sreepadom *pattom* is brought under the definition of the term public revenue. Sir, I do not wish to say anything more in regard to this matter. I think I have made it plain that, as a matter of legislative policy, as a matter of adminstrative policy, and as a matter of principle, the proposed amendment of the Law Member is highly objectionable. Of course, as I stated, my object is to minimise the injury as far as possible. Then if you view it from the point of view of necessity, I believe, I have conclusively shown there is no necessity for any change in the existing law. Apart from the questions of policy and principle, apart from considerations of necessity, if you view the matter in another aspect it will be a means of allowing people who may after all be irresponsible to annoy and molest innocent citizens. So the consequences, the possible or probable bad consequences, are really such as cannot be contemplated with equanimity. There is no justification for investing the Sreepadom employees with these wide powers. My wonder is why Government should have launched on this enterprise. So, Sir, I fully believe that all the aspects of the matter that have been placed before the House will receive the very careful consideration of the entire House, at least of this part of the House which is composed of gentlemen and a lady whose function is to see that the rights of the citizens are not allowed to be violated. This measure affects the elementary principles of citizenship, the fundamental consideration that ought to engage the attention of a legislative body. I hope this House will not err, will not fail, in the discharge of its duty on this occasion. With these words, Sir, I commend my amendment to the acceptance of the House.

PRESIDENT: I put before the House the amendment moved by Mr. Thanu Pillai, *viz.*,

"Provided that the powers to be exercised by Peishkars and Tahsildars under this Regulation shall not be vested in any employee of the Sreepadom Palace."

The amendment was put to the vote of the House and lost.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum*): I demand a poll.

A poll was taken with the following result:—

AYES—13.

1	Mr.	K. C. Chandi
2	,,	A. S. Damodaran Asan
3	,,	K. Gopalakrishna Pillai
4	,,	K. Krishnan Nayar
5	,,	N. K. Krishna Pillai
6	,,	K. Kunjukrishna Pillai
7	,,	K. Madhavan Pillai
8	Mr.	K. P. Madhavan Pillai (*Chirayinkil*)
9	,,	K. P. Madhavan Pillai (*Shertallai*)
10	,,	A. Narayana Pillai
11	,,	K. Narayanaperumal Nadar
12	,,	K. Padmanabha Panikkar
13	,,	A. Thanu Pillai

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

NOES—24.

1 Mrs. Anna Chandi	13 Mr. K. George
2 Mr. S. Chattanatha Karayalar	14 ,, P. Gomatinayakam Pillai
3 ,, N. John Joseph	15 ,, P. N. Krishna Pillai
4 ,, K. C. Karunakaran	16 ,, R. Krishna Pillai
5 ,, K. I. Kocheeppan Mappilla	17 Rao Sahib Dr. N. Kunjan Pillai
6 Rao Bahadur K. A. Krishna Aiyangar	18 Mr. E. G. McAlpine
7 Mr. M. Mahomed Mustapha	19 ,, C. O. Madhavan
8 ,, P. S. Mahomed	20 ,, R. Nilakanta Pillai
9 ,, Rama Varma Raja	21 ,, Kayalam Paramesvaran Pillai
10 ,, R. S. Subrahmanya Pillai	22 Dr. K. Raman Tampi
11 ,, L. A. Bishop	23 Mr. R. Vaidyalingom Pillai
12 ,, R. Dhanukoti Pillai	24 ,, J. S. Westerdale

NEUTRAL—1.

Mr. M. P. Madhavan Pillai

The amendment was declared lost, 13 voting *for* the amendment, 24 *against* and one remaining *neutral*.

PRESIDENT: The next amendment of Mr. Kunjukrishna Pillai on the agenda is identical with an amendment already moved and rejected by the Council. I therefore rule it out of order.

The next amendment is one which is substantially covered by the amendment which has now been rejected by the Council.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum*): May I know at which amendment we are now?

PRESIDENT: Amendment No. 3.

It is substantially covered by the decision that has been given by the Council now. I rule that out of order.

The fourth amendment on the agenda is.—

"Add the following to the explanation:
.....whose officers are recruited in accordance with the rules issued from time to time by Government under the T. S. R."

This is also identical with the amendment that was moved in a previous session and rejected by the Council and therefore I rule that also out of order.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum*): The fourth amendment relates only to recruitment.

PRESIDENT: That is substantially identical with the amendment that was moved and rejected by the Council at a previous sitting.

Now, the question before the House is that the clause as amended do stand part of the Bill.

MR. K. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI (*Quilon*): I oppose it.

The motion was put to the vote of the House and carried.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum*): I demand a poll.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

A poll was taken with the following result ;—

AYES—25.

1 Mrs. Anna Chandi
2 Mr. S. Chattanatha Karayalar
3 ,, N. John Joseph
4 ,, K. C. Karunakaran
5 ,, K. I. Kocheeppan Mappilla
6 ,, K. P. Kochukora Tarakan
7 Rao Bahadur K. A. Krishna Aiyangar
8 Mr. M. Mahomed Mustapha
9 ,, P. S. Mahomed
10 ,, Rama Varma Raja
11 ,, R. S. Subrahmanya Pillai
12 Mr. L. A. Bishop
13 ,, R. Dhanukoti Pillai
14 ,, K. George
15 ,, P. Gomatinayakam Pillai
16 ,, P. N. Krishna Pillai
17 ,, R. Krishna Pillai.
18 Rao Sahib Dr. N. Kunjan Pillai
19 Mr. E. G. McAlpine
20 ,, C. O. Madhavan
21 ,, R. Nilakanta Pillai
22 ,, Kayalam Paramesvaran Pillai
23 Dr. K. Raman Tampi
24 Mr. R. Vaidyalingom Pillai
25 ,, J. S. Westerdale

NOES—15.

1 Mr. K. C. Chandi
2 ,, A. S. Damodaran Asan
3 ,, K. Gopalakrishna Pillai
4 ,, Joseph Kunju
5 ,, K. Krishnan Nayar
6 ,, N. K. Krishna Pillai
7 ,, Tariath Kunjitomman
8 ,, K. Kunjukrishna Pillai
9 ,, K. Madhavan Pillai
10 Mr. K. P. Madhavan Pillai (*Chirayinkil*)
11 ,, K. P. Madhavan Pillai (*Shertallai*)
12 ,, A. Narayana Pillai
13 ,, K. Narayanaperumal Nadar
14 ,, K. Padmanabha Panikkar
15 ,, A. Thanu Pillai

NEUTRAL—1.

Mr. M. P. Madhavan Pillai.

The question that the clause as amended do stand part of the Bill was declared carried, 25 voting *for* the same, 15 *against* and 1 remaining *neutral*.

PRESIDENT : The question before the House is that the Preamble do stand part of the Bill.

The motion was carried.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*) : I beg to move that the Bill be taken up and passed at a subsequent meeting.

MR. R. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Financial Secretary to Government*) : I second it.

The motion was carried.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly